



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,303	04/16/2004	Yasushi Takai	0171-1056P	7758
2292	7590	08/25/2004	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			MCNEIL, JENNIFER C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1775	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/825,303	Applicant(s) TAKAI ET AL	
	Examiner Jennifer C McNeil	Art Unit 1775	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 10/173,030.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Double Patenting*

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 8 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,753,085.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter of claim 8 is essentially the same structure as claimed in the patent.

Claim 8 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claim 12 of copending Application No. 10/173,031. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: a carbon substrate with a

Art Unit: 1775

lanthanoid oxide coating thereon. It is well known in the art that yttrium is a lanthanoid metal, and therefore would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Subramanian (US 6,294,260). Subramanian teaches a barrier coating for turbine components. The barrier coating comprises an oxide with the base structure of  $(A,B)_xO_y$ . A and B may be selected from rare earth elements such as La, Dy, Ho, Er, Gd, Yb, Eu, and Sm. Subramanian teaches that the substrate may be a superalloy with a composition including Cr.Al.Co.Ta.Mo.W (col. I, lines 31-35).

Regarding claim 4, as stated above, both A and B may be a rare earth, such as Yb.

Regarding claim 5, the thickness of the layer may be 0.0112-0.254 cm.

Art Unit: 1775

Regarding claim 7, the process by which the product is made has not been shown to structurally define over the prior art.

Claims 1, 2, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Maloney (US 6,177,200). Maloney teaches a ceramic material used as a thermal barrier on metal substrates. The ceramic material comprises the composition  $A_2B_2O_7$ , wherein A may be gadolinium, lanthanum, yttrium or mixtures thereof, and B may be zirconium, hafnium, titanium, and mixtures thereof. The substrate may be an iron, nickel, or cobalt based metal and containing chromium and aluminum and usually containing titanium and refractory metals. Other substrates that may be used include steels, and titanium alloys.

Regarding claim 7, the process by which the product is made has not been shown to structurally define over the prior art.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beele (US 6,387,526) in view of Strangman (US 5,514,482). Beele teaches a thermal barrier layer including a substrate of an iron, cobalt or nickel superalloy and a layer of an oxide having the structure  $A_2B_2O_7$ , wherein A may be samarium, gadolinium or

Art Unit: 1775

europium. Therefore this layer is a rare-earth containing oxide. Beele does not specifically teach a nickel superalloy substrate alloys with one of the elements of the instant claims. Nickel, iron, and cobalt superalloys are well known in the art of turbine engines. Strangman teaches some common nickel-superalloys as shown in Table I. Each superalloy includes at least one of the elements listed in instant claim 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use on of the commonly known superalloys of Strangman as the superalloy substrate in Beele, as they are both used in turbine engine components for their high temperature durability.

Regarding claim 3, Beele teaches that ytterbium, samarium, or europium may be the rare-earth element.

Regarding claim 5, Beele does not teach a specific thickness of the thermal barrier coating, however, absent a showing of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a layer with sufficient thickness to provide the desired thermal barrier properties to the underlying substrate.

Regarding claim 6, an additional layer may be formed over the thermal barrier coating. The additional layer may comprise the same composition of the thermal barrier layer, wherein B is Hf or Zr, and A may be lanthanum (col. 6, lines 33-40).

Regarding claim 7, the process by which the product is made has not been shown to structurally define over the prior art.

Claims 1, 5, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heimberg et al (US 6,440,575) in view of Strangman (US 5,514,482). Heimberg

Art Unit: 1775

teaches a ceramic thermal layer for turbine engine components. The substrate is a nickel, cobalt, or chromium based superalloy. The substrate is coated with a bonding layer which when the underlying layer contains lanthanum, leads to the formation of lanthanum oxide in the bonding layer. Heimberg does not specifically teach a nickel superalloy substrate alloyed with one of the elements in the instant claims. Nickel, iron, and cobalt superalloys are well known in the art of turbine engines. Strangman teaches some common nickel superalloys shown in Table 1. Each superalloy includes at least one of the elements listed in instant claim 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use one of the commonly known superalloys of Strangman as the superalloy substrate in Heimberg, as they are both used in turbine engine components for their high temperature durability.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maloney (US 6,177,200). Maloney teaches a ceramic coating on a metal substrate as discussed above, but does not specify the thickness of the ceramic coating. Absent a showing of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a layer with sufficient thickness to provide the desired thermal barrier properties to the underlying substrate.

### *Conclusion*

Art Unit: 1775

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer C McNeil whose telephone number is 571-272-1540. The examiner can normally be reached on 9AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on 571-272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jennifer McNeil  
Primary Examiner